

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

April 4, 2002 LB 647

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Or am I...am I...let's...

SENATOR STUHR: Um, no. No, they're all at-large.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Oh, they're all at-large now?

SENATOR STUHR: Yes, they're all at-large, yes.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Okay, but no more than two at-large can be from the same...

SENATOR STUHR: From the same...

SENATOR SCHIMEK: ...county.

SENATOR STUHR: Yes.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: That's current law. Okay.

SENATOR STUHR: Yes.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Thank you.

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: Senator Hartnett.

SENATOR HARTNETT: Mr. Speaker, members of the body, Senator Stuhr or Senator Raikes, as I read the explanation and so forth, the fifth candidate would not be put in and the vacancy would...as I read the..."Candidate Peters" would not be elected and a vacancy would exist. That means that "Candidate Brown", in your example, would not be put into this at-large and there could be a vacancy? There would be another runoff election or what? I guess just more for clarification is all, Senator Stuhr or Senator Raikes. Senator Stuhr, if you want to.

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: Senator Stuhr.

SENATOR STUHR: Yes, Senator Hartnett, the board would then fill the vacancy. They would have the opportunity to fill the vacancy.